



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,253	12/15/2003	Junichi Mashiko	1080.1133	2285
21171	7590	04/07/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			JEANTY, ROMAIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/734,253

Applicant(s)

MASHIKO ET AL.

Examiner

Romain Jeanty

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication received January 9, 2006.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application.

### **Response to Arguments**

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan et al "Hogan" (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,637) in view of Griffin et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,303,145).

As per claim 1, Hogan discloses a method for call conferencing. In so doing, Hogan an accepting section which accepts necessary information needed for scheduling of a given conference (i.e., receiving a request time to schedule a conference) (col. 12, lines 1-10), the necessary information containing a scheduled time of the entire conference (col. 12, lines 1-10).

Hogan discloses all of the limitations above, but Hogan fails to explicitly disclose guaranteed time which needs to be secured at the minimum and desired, normally requested time

Art Unit: 3623

for each subject to be addressed. Griffin et al in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept minimum amount of time dedicated for setting up a meeting/conference (col. 4, lines 13-27). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Hogan et al to include a guaranteed time which needs to be secured at the minimum and desired, normally requested time for each subject to be addressed as evidenced by Griffin et al in order to determine if an available meeting time complies with required parameters.

As per claim 3, Hogan et al further discloses the conference management assistance apparatus wherein the information accepting section further accepts input of the order in which the subjects will be addressed at the conference, and the schedule planning section plans a schedule according to the order at the conference, accepted by the information accepting section (col. 4, lines 13-27).

As per claim 4, Hogan further discloses a schedule display section which displays the schedule planned by the schedule planning section (col. 19, lines 42-48).

As per claim 5, Hogan further discloses a schedule management section which measures the time from the start of discussion of the subjects addressed at the conference and gives a notice when a scheduled discussion end time of a subject under discussion comes according to the schedule planned by the schedule planning section (i.e. determining the time and duration for the conference) (col. 15, lines 22-32; col. 20, line 66 through col. 21, line 20).

As per claims 6-7, and 13-14, the claimed features are standard practice used in the conference management system. For example participants are usually give the option to modify or updating their conference time information, and rescheduling usually occurs due to the

Art Unit: 3623

modification. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include such features in order to provide conference call features to users.

As per claim 8, claim 8 recites a conference management assistance system program that runs on a computer for performing the steps of claim 1; therefore, claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale relied upon of claim 1.

As per claim 10, claim 10 recites a conference management assistance program for performing the steps of claim 3; therefore, claim 8 is rejected under the same rationale relied upon of claim 3.

As per claim 11, claim 11 recites a conference management assistance program for performing the steps of claim 4 above; therefore, claim 11 is rejected under the same rationale relied upon of claim 4.

As per claim 12, claim 12 recites a conference management assistance program for performing the steps of claim 5 above; therefore, claim 11 is rejected under the same rationale relied upon of claim 5.

4. Claims 2, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogan et al "Hogan" (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,637) in view of Griffin et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,303,145) and further in view of Balasubramanian (U.S. Patent No. 6,687,257).

As per claims 2 and 9, the combination of Hogan and Griffin does Not disclose wherein the information accepting section further accepts input of priority of time allocation for each subject to be addressed, and the schedule planning section allocates the normally requested times to the subjects in descending order of priority among the subjects to be addressed at the conference according to the priority accepted by the information accepting

Art Unit: 3623

section within the scheduled time of the entire conference and allocates the minimum guaranteed times to the remaining subjects to be addressed at the conference other than the subjects to which normally requested times are allocated. However, Balasubramanian discloses the concept of prior (col. 10, line 10 through col. 11, line 23). I would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of Hogan and Griffin to incorporate the teachings of Balasubramanian with the motivation to allowing both efficient use of resources and the ability to guarantee the execution of critical tasks.

### Remarks

5. Applicant asserted that Koreeda et al does not disclose the claimed invention. Applicant further asserted on page 7 that claim 1 recites determining a conference based on the amount of content that needs to be addressed. In response, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **determining a conference based on the amount of content that needs to be addressed**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. McArdle (U.S. Patent No. 5,581,702) relates to the field of sharing information in a computer conferencing system.

Art Unit: 3623

b. Larson (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,324) discloses method which allows a participant in a desktop conference to store conference characteristics and parameters into a persistent conference object.


c. Suda (U.S. Patent No. 6,279,000) discloses an information and apparatus for managing schedule data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571) 272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RJ

  
Romain Jeanty  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3623  
3/20/2006